

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain in the application and claims 1 and 13 have been amended hereby.

A certified copy of priority document P11-307637 filed in Japan on October 28, 1999 is submitted herewith as Exhibit A.

A signed declaration was submitted on February 12, 2001 in response to the Notice to File Missing Parts mailed December 21, 2000. A copy of the response including a signed declaration is submitted herewith as Exhibit B.

Replacement sheets including changes to Figs. 1 and 5 are submitted herewith as Exhibit C. In particular, reference 2 has been added to designate the service operating company in Fig. 2 and steps 101-109 in Fig. 5 have been re-labeled S101-S109.

The paragraph of the specification starting at page 6, line 9 has been amended to refer to the Internet as shown in Fig. 1.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended hereby to address all the objections set forth in the Office Action at page 3.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-14, 16-19, and 22-24 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al.

Features of the data receiving method and apparatus according to the present invention are a decoded data diagnostic unit (45 in Fig. 3) for determining whether a decoding diagnostic code (shown in Fig. 4) added during packet transmission and a

predetermined constant match and to delete packets that do not match. See the paragraph bridging pages 20 and 21 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ueno et al. and Horikoshi et al. fail to show or suggest determining whether a decoding diagnostic code added during packet transmission and a predetermined constant match and to delete packets that do not match.

Ueno et al. is merely disclosing an error detecting section (214) for detecting a decoding error and outputting error detecting information and, because there are no features in Horikoshi et al. that somehow could be combined with Ueno et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and 13, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 3 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Kim et al.

Claims 3 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, which rejections over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. have been addressed above and, because there are no features in Kim et al. that somehow could be combined with Ueno et al. and Horikoshi et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 15 are patentably

distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Kim et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Trostle.

Claims 8 and 9, and 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, which rejections over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. have been addressed above and, because there are no features in Trostle that somehow could be combined with Ueno et al. and Horikoshi et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 are patentably distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Trostle.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:tb